P14

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,161	05/10/1999	LAWRENCE CUI	OLAL1006.002	7164

23910 7590 05/01/2003

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER	
PAULA, CESAR B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	12

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/309,161	Applicant(s) CUI ET AL.	
	Examiner CESAR B PAULA	Art Unit 2178	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: *See Continuation Sheet*.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☒ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-14*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant requests the withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph of claims 2, 5-8, 14, based upon the amendment to the claims (p.5,L.10-17). The amendment to these claims cannot be entered at this time, when the prosecution of this case has been closed, because the amendment necessitates a new search and/or consideration.

Moreover, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph of claim 10, based upon the amendment to the claim (p.5,L.21-p.6,L.2). The amendment to this claim cannot be entered at this time, when the prosecution of this case has been closed, because the amendment necessitates a new search and/or consideration.

Moreover, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph of claim 11, based upon the amendment to the claim (p.6,L.6-9). The amendment to this claim cannot be entered at this time, when the prosecution of this case has been closed, because the amendment necessitates a new search and/or consideration.

Further, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph of claim 12, based upon the amendment to the claim (p.6,L.13-16). The amendment to this claim cannot be entered at this time, when the prosecution of this case has been closed, because the amendment necessitates a new search and/or consideration.

In addition, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph of claims 11, 2, 5-8, based upon the amendment to the claim (p.7,L.1-11). The amendment to these claims overcome the lack of antecedent basis. However, it cannot be entered at this time when the prosecution of this case has been closed, because the amendment necessitates a new search and/or consideration.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "Quinlan fails to disclose the detection of cookies" p.7,L.19-22) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claims 1-9, and 12-14, the Applicant states that Quinlan fails to explicitly teach the stripping off any cookies, and Wagner fails to teach storing the cookies in a repository (p.7,L.19-p.8,L.6, 14-28). Quinlan discloses generating, and appending of a session id to urls, instead of using cookies (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach stripping off any cookies set by an external web site from the response header of the response web page, and storing the cookies in a repository. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers (c.3,L.1-67). Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting and then storing it at a repository or storage location (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches the deletion and storage of data without user invocation (c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Moreover, the Applicant states that McGee fails to make up for the deficiencies in Quinlan, and Wagner, and fails to teach appending the session id to all the URLs in the web page (p.7,L.19-p.8,L.6, 14-28). The Examiner disagrees, because McGee discloses the appending of a user's login name or session id to all the URLs links embedded in a web page(s) (c.10,L.34-67, c.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and appended sent the web page to the requesting user, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and McGee discloses assure that only authorized users can access web pages (c.4,L.43-67).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "an advantage of this aspect of the invention is that the client is not provided with the actual reference information, such as a URL" p.9,L.2-4) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed Cir. 1993).

Moreover, the Applicant indicates that Langford fails to explicitly teach the storage of cookies in a repository (p.9,L.10-17). Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting and then storing it at a repository or storage location (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches the deletion and storage of data without user invocation, and this would have enabled a user to later recover, and review the deleted cookies in a safe and secure manner (c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Moreover, the Applicant submits that there is not a reasonable expectation for success in combining the references to reintroduce a cookie to the header of a webpage (p.10, L.8-19). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach retrieving a cookie from the cookie repository corresponding to the existing session id. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers, and sending the modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). Langford teaches the deletion of desired data, encrypting, storing it at a repository or storage location to be retrieved by a user at a later time (c.2,L.34-c.3,L.67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and stored them in a repository, because Wagner teaches above, the remova of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and Langford teaches protecting data deleted by a user for later retrieval, and use. In this case a cookie needed by the user at a later time would be retrieved from the repository or storage and reinstated into its place in a web page cookie header(c.1,L.66-c.2,L.67).

Furthermore, the Applicant submits that Olden does not teach the setting of a lifetime for a session (p.11, L.14-19). The amendment to this claim cannot be entered at this time, when the prosecution of this case has been closed, because the amendment necessitates a new search and/or consideration.